

REMARKS

Claims 2, 7, and 12 have been canceled. Claims 3-5, 8-10, 13-30, and amended claims 1, 6, 11, 31 and 32 are in this application.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13, and 15-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Panasonic in view of Lawler et al.

Each of independent claims 1, 6, 11, 31 and 32 has been amended herein. As a result, and as an example, amended independent claim 1 now recites in part the following:

"a display being operable to have displayed thereon in response to a control signal from said display controller a cursor, a day of a week display portion which provides a display for each day of the week and representations of programs for a plurality of channels having a plural number of past programs each of whose broadcast time is prior to a present time, a plural number of present programs each of whose broadcast time contains said present time, and a plural number of future programs each of whose broadcast time is subsequent to said present time, said representation of each of said plural number of past programs currently in the display being in a first color, said representation of each of said plural number of present programs currently in the display being in a second color different from said first color, and said representation of each of said plural number of future programs currently in the display being in a third color different from said first and second colors, in which the cursor is movable to a representation of a desired program; and

means for enabling a user to select a desired day from the day of the week display portion and a program therefrom for programming a

recording of the program or for watching or listening to the program," (Emphasis added.)

It is believed that the present application provides support for the features herein added to claim 1. With regard thereto, and as an example, reference is made to paragraphs 0031-0032 and Fig. 4 of the present application.

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Panasonic and Lawler applied by the Examiner does not appear to specifically disclose the above-identified features of claim 1 for at least the reasons described below.

That is, and as an example, in explaining the above 103 rejection with regard to claim 1 (see pages 3-4 of the present Office Action), the Examiner appears to assert that the display and the means for enabling are disclosed on pages 24-25 of Panasonic. In response, it is submitted that such portions of Panasonic do not appear to specifically disclose a display having "a day of a week display portion which provides a display for each day of the week" and "means for enabling a user to select a desired day from the day of the week display portion and a program therefrom . . . ." (Emphasis added.) An example of such day of the week display portion is illustrated as element 72 in Fig. 4 of the present application. On the other hand, with regard to Panasonic, although page 24 of Panasonic appears to mention a "Channel Guide" that lists seven days of television information, it appears that such Channel Guide does not have a day of a week display portion (which provides a display for each day of the week) and means for enabling a user to select a desired day therefrom. Instead, it appears that the Channel Guide requires a user to manually "scroll through listings for shows . . . in the next seven days." (See top right portion of page 24 of Panasonic.)

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 as presented herein is distinguishable from the combination of Panasonic and Lawler applied by the Examiner.

For reasons similar or somewhat similar to those previously described with regard to claim 1, it is also respectfully submitted that independent claims 6, 11, 31 and 32 as presented herein are distinguishable from the combination of Panasonic and Lawler applied by the Examiner.

Claims 3, 5, 8, 10, 13, and 15-30 are dependent from one of the amended independent claims and, as such, are also distinguishable from the combination of Panasonic and Lawler applied by the Examiner for at least the reasons discussed above.

Claims 4, 9, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Panasonic in view of Lawler et al. and further in view of Lemmons.

Claims 4, 9, and 14 are dependent from one of the independent claims and are also distinguishable from the combination of Panasonic and Lawler applied by the Examiner for at least the reasons discussed above. The Examiner does not appear to have relied upon Lemmons to overcome the above described deficiencies of Panasonic. As such, claims 4, 9, and 14 are believed to be distinguishable from the applied combination of Panasonic, Lawler and Lemmons.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been overcome, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested

Application No.: 09/931,798

Docket No.: SONYJP 3.0-202

that the Examiner telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional rejections and/or objections which the Examiner might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: May 22, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Dennis M. Smid, Esq.

Registration No.: 34,930

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicant(s)